

Appl. No.: 09/478,112
Amtd. dated: July 2, 2004
Reply to final Office action of March 5, 2004

Patent
Attorney Docket: EPI-027 US
7008122001

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-21, and 23-27 have been rejected. Claims 1, 16, and 17 have been amended. Claim 15 has been canceled.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,233,576 issued to Lewis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,568 issued to Dircks et al.

Lewis discloses a scheme for implementing flexible control of subject authorizations. Lewis does not disclose "associating with at least one of the clients a grant permission that enables the client to give to another client a user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities, in which the user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities is determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," as recited in claim 1.

Dircks discloses a desktop administration system and method which allows a network administrator to remotely create, protect, and manage desktops and control file systems across a network. Dircks does not disclose "associating with at least one of the clients a grant permission that enables the client to give to another client a user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities, in which the user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities is determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," as recited in claim 1.

Even if Lewis and Dircks were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "associating with at least one of the clients a grant permission that enables the client to give to another client a user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities, in

Appl. No.: 09/478,112
Amdt. dated: July 2, 2004
Reply to final Office action of March 5, 2004

Patent
Attorney Docket: EPI-027 US
7008122001

which the user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities is determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks. Given that claims 2-11 and 13-14 depend from claim 1, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Lewis and Dircks.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis and Dircks. Claim 16 recites "associating with at least one of the clients a grant permission that enables the client to give to another client a user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities, in which the user permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities is determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis and Dircks. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis and Dircks. Claim 17 recites "computer instructions for associating with at least one of the users a grant permission that enables the user to give to another user a permission with respect at least one of the digital facilities, the access permission or the grant permission with respect to at least one of the digital facilities is determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis and Dircks. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 17 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis and Dircks. Claim 18 recites "grant information regarding the power of the user to grant a permission to another user with respect to at least one of the digital facilities, the grant permission with respect to at least

Appl. No.: 09/478,112
Amdt. dated: July 2, 2004
Reply to final Office action of March 5, 2004

Patent
Attorney Docket: EPI-027 US
7008122001

one of the digital facilities determined by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis and Dircks. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis and Dircks. Claim 21 recites "determining the permissions by a combination of an individual permission and a company permission," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis and Dircks. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks. Given that claims 23-26 depend from claim 21, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis and Dircks. Claim 27 recites "automatically making a user who creates a user profile for another user or for a company a relationship manager of the other user or the company," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis and Dircks. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over Lewis and Dircks.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Lewis in view of Dircks and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,505 issued to Schneider et al.

Claim 19 recites "automatically allowing the first individual to manage one or more relationships of the second individual with other individuals, via the electronic communication medium with respect to the digital facility, with the individual profile of the second individual," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis, Dircks, and Schneider. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over Lewis, Dircks, and Schneider.

Appl No.: 09/478,112
Amdt. dated: July 2, 2004
Reply to final Office action of March 5, 2004

Patent
Attorney Docket: EPI-027 US
7008122001

Claim 20 recites "automatically making the user who creates the user profile for the other user a relationship manager of the other user with the profile of the other user," which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Lewis, Dircks, and Schneider. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over Lewis, Dircks, and Schneider.

Appl. No.: 09/478,112
Amdt. dated: July 2, 2004
Reply to final Office action of March 5, 2004

Patent
Attorney Docket: EPI-027 US
7008122001

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

DATE: July 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Fabio E. Marino

Registration No. 43,339

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4952
Telefax: (650) 849-4800